UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/660,643	09/12/2003 ·	Kristin A. Jugenheimer	10546/55605	7586	
23838 KENYON & K	7590 01/17/2007 ENYON LLP		EXAM	EXAMINER	
1500 K STREE	1500 K STREET N.W. TRUONG, KEVIN T		EVIN THAO		
SUITE 700 WASHINGTO	N, DC 20005		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3734		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MO	NTHS	01/17/2007	. РАГ	PER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

•		hs	***			
·	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commons	10/660,643	JUGENHEIMER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kevin T. Truong	3734				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address	; 			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUN R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may n. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) Mo tatute, cause the application to become	IICATION. a reply be timely filed DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	13 October 2006.					
•—	This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for all	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-20 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-20 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.					
Application Papers		•				
9) The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.	•				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	1					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in priority documents have bee ireau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National Stage	e			
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	v Summary (PTO-413)				
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper N	o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application				

Application/Control Number: 10/660,643

Art Unit: 3734

DETAILED ACTION

Note: This is in response to an Amendment filed 10/13/2006.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-10 and 12-20 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,911,032. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the relatively broad subject matter claimed in the instant application such as a clip coupled to an endoscope, wherein the clip having a ring portion, a plurality of legs attached to the ring portion, and a locking mechanism to restrict the movement of each of the legs from the closed to the open position. These recitations would have been obvious in view of the relatively detailed subject matter of the patent claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/660,643 Page 3

Art Unit: 3734

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 10/13/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 and 12-20 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin T. Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-4705. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Hayes can be reached on 571-272-4959. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

> Kevin T. (T) uong Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3734

Page 4

ktt